arXiv:1610.02390v1 [gr-qc] 7 Oct 2016

WHETHER THE METRIC IS ESSENTIALLY SMOOTH AT SHOCK WAVES IN GENERAL RELATIVITY DEPENDS ON A HIDDEN GEOMETRIC STRUCTURE

MORITZ REINTJES AND BLAKE TEMPLE

OCTOBER 7, 2016

Abstract. In General Relativity, the gravitational metric tensor is only known to be Lipschitz continuous at shock waves, a regularity so low that locally inertial frames might not exist. It is an open question whether there exist (singular) coordinate transformations which can raise the metric regularity by one level, from Lipschitz continuous ($C^{0,1}$) to $C^{1,1}$. A $C^{1,1}$ regularity suffices to construct locally inertial frames within the atlas of smooth coordinate transformations. We here address this regularity question for symmetric connections of bounded variation, a most general framework for shock waves in GR. We prove that the question whether there exists a coordinate transformation which smooths the metric from $C^{0,1}$ to $C^{1,1}$ in a neighborhood of a point p is equivalent to the condition that the singular part of the spacetime connection (of the shock discontinuities) can be extended to a Riemann flat connection in that neighborhood. We then define the "essential curvature of the singular part of the spacetime connection" as the minimum curvature over all such extensions, and prove that the metric can be smoothed to $C^{1,1}$ if and only if this curvature is zero. As an application we prove that locally inertial frames always exist at shock waves in two dimensions, independent of whether or not the metric regularity can be raised above $C^{0,1}$.

1. Introduction

In this paper we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for determining the essential smoothness of the gravitational metric at points of shock wave interaction in General Relativity. It is well known that shock waves form in solutions of the Einstein-Euler equations, the equations that couple the spacetime geometry to perfect fluid sources, whenever the flow is sufficiently compressive [9, 14, 2]. But it is an open question as to the essential level of smoothness of the gravitational metric for general shock wave solutions admitting points of shock wave interaction. But the existence theory [6] for shock waves in GR only yields Lipschitz continuity ($C^{0,1}$) of the spacetime metric, a metric regularity too low for locally inertial coordinates to exist

M. Reintjes is a Post-Doctorate at IMPA, funded through CAPES-Brazil.
B. Temple was supported by NSF Applied Mathematics Grant Number DMS-010-2493.

within the atlas of smooth (C^2) coordinate transformations [13]. In locally inertial coordinates with respect ot some point p, the metric is Minkowski at p and all coordinate derivatives of the metric vanish at p. The requisite smoothness of the metric sufficient for the existence of locally inertial frames within the smooth atlas is $C^{1,1}$, one degree smoother than the $C^{0,1}$ metric constructed in [6]. Namely, for a $C^{1,1}$ metric regularity the Riemann normal coordinate construction generates a smooth transformation to locally inertial coordinates. In [12], the authors proposed the possibility that shock wave interaction might create a new kind of spacetime singularity which we named *regularity singularities*, a point in spacetime where the Lorentzian metric cannot be smoothed to $C^{1,1}$, the smoothness to admit locally inertial coordinates within the smooth atlas. However, like other singularities in GR, such as the event horizon of the Schwarzschild solution, a singularity requires a singular coordinate transformation to regularize it. Thus the possibility remains that the spacetime metric at shock waves might be smoothed from $C^{0,1}$ to $C^{1,1}$ within the larger atlas of less regular $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations, since for these transformations the Jacobians are only Lipschitz continuous and jumps in the derivatives of the Jacobian at shock waves hold the possibility that such transformations might eliminate the jump in metric derivatives. It remains an outstanding open problem as to whether such transformations exist in general at points of shock wave interaction in GR. In particular, if such smoothing transformations did not exist at some point of shock wave interaction, then *regularity singularities* could be created by shock wave interaction alone and the scattering type effect introduced in [13] might exist in gravitational radiation.

Regarding this basic regularity question the only results so far are Israel's celebrated 1966 paper [8], which proves that for any smooth co-dimension one shock surface in n dimensions the gravitational metric can always be smoothed from $C^{0,1}$ to $C^{1,1}$ by transformation to Gaussian normal coordinates adjusted to the shock surface. This transformation was identified as an element of the $C^{1,1}$ atlas in [15]. However, these coordinates are only defined for single, non-interacting shock surfaces and do not exist for the more complicated $C^{0,1}$ metrics constructed in the Groah-Temple framework [6]. The only result going beyond Israel's result for smooth shock surfaces was accomplished in [13, 11], where authors proved that the gravitational metric *can* always be smoothed from $C^{0,1}$ to $C^{1,1}$ at a point of regular shock wave interaction in spherical symmetry between shocks from different characteristic families. The proof is based on a completely new constructive method tailored to the structure of the interaction, and it is not clear whether or how this proof could be extended to more complicated shock wave interactions. Thus, for more complicated shock wave interactions, like asymmetric shock interactions in $(3 + 1)$-dimensions, or interactions that create rarefaction waves, the question as to the locally flat nature of space-time, and whether regularity singularities can be created by shock wave interactions, remains an open problem.

For perfect fluids, shock waves are weak solutions of the Einstein-Euler equations $G = 8\pi T$, $DivT = 0$, where G is the Einstein curvature tensor and T is the stress tensor for a perfect fluid, [18]. In this case, to be a shock wave and not a surface layer with delta function sources in T, the fluid stress tensor T must be a bounded function with discontinuities at the shocks but *no* delta function sources. The Einstein equations imply that the curvature tensor G must also then be at worst bounded and discontinuous, and thus also be free of delta function sources. Since G is a tensor computed from second order coordinate derivatives of the gravitational metric g, and since a metric which is only Lipschitz continuous will in general have delta functions in the coordinate second derivatives of g, it follows that to be a shock wave, delta function sources in the second derivatives of the metric must cancel out in G to make G at worst a bounded discontinuous tensor as well. The atlas of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations was introduced as in [15] as the natural atlas for shock waves in GR because coordinate transformations in $C^{1,1}$ not only map Lipschitz continuous metrics to Lipschitz continuous metrics, but also map bounded discontinuous curvature tensors to bounded discontinuous curvature tensors, c.f. Theorem 2.1.

In this paper we address the question of regularity singularities at the level of general symmetric connections Γ^k_{ij} of bounded variation (BV) on n-dimensional manifolds, presumably the most general framework relevant for general relativistic shock waves. For metric connections, the Christoffel formulas show that Γ^k_{ij} is equivalent to first derivatives of the metric, so we translate our question into the problem of determining whether a BV connection can be smoothed to $C^{0,1}$, within the atlas of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations with BV second derivatives. A $C^{0,1}$ regularity for a connection then suffices to map to locally inertial coordinates by a smooth coordinate transformation. However, in [13] we first proposed that the two problems are independent. Thus to clarify the issues, we define a *regularity singularity* in a BV connection to be a point p where the connection is not $C^{0,1}$ regular in any neighborhood of p, in any coordinate system of the $C^{1,1}$ atlas. We say the BV connection is locally inertial at p if there exist a coordinate system within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas in which the connection vanishes at p and is Lipschitz continuous at p. We say a regularity singularity is *weak* if there exists locally inertial coordinates systems within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas at p. We say a regularity singularity at a point p in a BV connection is *strong* if the connection does not admit locally inertial coordinates at p, i.e., the connection is not Lipschitz discontinuous at p in any coordinate system of the $C^{1,1}$ atlas.

Our main theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for a point p to be a regularity singularity of a BV connection. It states that a BV connection Γ can be transformed to a $C^{0,1}$ connection within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas in a neighborhood of p if and only if there exists a flat connection in a neighborhood of p with the same singular part as Γ. This reduces the problem of smoothing a connection to the problem of extending the

singular part of the connection to a flat connection in the spirit of the Nash embedding theorem, c.f. [10].

As a consequence of our methods, we prove that strong regularity singularities do not exist in two dimensional spacetimes. That is, we prove that at every point of a two dimensional BV connection, there always exist locally inertial coordinates within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas. It is still an open question whether weak regularity singularities exist in such spacetimes.

Finally, our main theorem leads us to defining the *essential curvature of the singular part* of a BV connection. Essentially, we define this to be the minimum of the curvature of all connections that agree with Γ on the singular set. Our theorem then states that a BV connection can be smoothed to $C^{0,1}$ if and only if the curvature of the singular part is zero.

We now introduce our framework and then state our main results, (see Section 2 for more details). We assume a n-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}$ endowed with a symmetric connection Γ, not necessarily a metric connection, such that in some coordinate system x^i each component Γ^k_{ij} is a BV function with L^∞-bound

$$\|\Gamma^k_{ij}\|_\infty \leq M_0. \tag{1.1}$$

To preserves the BV structure of the connection under coordinate transformations we assume from here on the atlas of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformation which have second derivatives in BV, where BV denotes the space of functions of bounded variation.[1] We denote this atlas by $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ but to save notation refer to its elements often simply as $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations.

For a BV-connection Γ, we introduce in Section 2 the components $R^k{}_{lij}$ of its Riemann curvature tensor, Riem(Γ), as Radon measures on $\mathcal{M}$.

In our main theorem, we prove that a BV connection can be transformed to a $C^{0,1}$ connection if and only if there exists an auxiliary BV connection $\hat{\Gamma}$ which coincides with the spacetime connection on the singular set, such that the Riemann tensor of $\hat{\Gamma}$ vanishes.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume Γ^k_{ij} is a symmetric BV connection satisfying the L^∞ bound (1.1) in coordinates x^i which are defined in a neighborhood of some point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exists a $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ transformation $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1}$ such that $\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \in C^{0,1}$ in a neighborhood of p if and only if there exists a Lipschitz continuous $(1,2)$-tensor in a neighborhood of p such that the BV connection $\hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij} \equiv \Gamma^k_{ij} - \tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij}$ satisfies Riem$(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0$. Moreover, if such a tensor exists then the smoothing transformation $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1}$ satisfies*

$$\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k} \hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij}.$$

[1] Note that derivatives of Lipschitz functions are not necessarily in BV, for instance the function $x \mapsto x^2 \sin(\frac{1}{x})$ is Lipschitz but its derivative are not in BV.

On can read Theorem 1.1 in the spirit of the famous Nash embedding theorems. Namely, $\hat{\Gamma}$ agrees with the original connection Γ exactly on the singular set (e.g., the shock fronts), since a Lipschitz tensor cannot alter the singular part (e.g., the discontinuity across a shock front) of Γ. Thus, $\hat{\Gamma}$ is the extension of the singular part of Γ into flat space and the open question of regularity singularities is whether one can embed the singular part of Γ (defined on the singular set) into flat $\mathbb{R}^n$ as the ambient space.

The main step in proving Theorem 1.1 is to establish the following supporting theorem, which requires a careful analysis and gives a construction of the coordinate transformation $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1}$:

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $\hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij}$ is a symmetric BV connection satisfying the L^∞-bound (1.1) in coordinates x^i which are defined in a neighborhood of some point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Then*

$$Riem(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0,$$

in the weak sense (2.4) - (2.5) *in a neighborhood of $p \in \mathcal{M}$, if and only if there exists a $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ transformation $y \circ x^{-1}$ such that in coordinates y^α*

$$\hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \;=\; 0 \quad a.e.$$

in a neighborhood of $p \in \mathcal{M}$.

Based on Theorem 1.1, we propose a natural definition of a curvature scalar of the singular part of a BV connection, c.f. Section 5 for details. The existence of regularity singularities is the equivalent to this curvature to be non-zero. In more detail, assuming $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is a Lorentz manifold, we introduce an auxilliary Riemannian metric h on $\mathcal{M}$ and define for a given symmetric BV connection $\hat{\Gamma}$ the positive measure

$$\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big] \equiv (h^{-1})^{\nu\bar{\nu}}(h^{-1})^{\lambda\bar{\lambda}}(h^{-1})^{\sigma\bar{\sigma}} h_{\mu\bar{\mu}} (R_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{\mu}{}_{\nu\lambda\sigma} (R_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{\bar{\mu}}{}_{\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}},$$

which vanishes if and only if the Riemann curvature of $\hat{\Gamma}$ vanishes.

Definition 1.3. *Let Γ be the Christoffel symbol of the Lorentz metric g. We define the "essential curvature of the singular part" of Γ as the measure*

$$\alpha(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \inf_{K \geq 0} \alpha_K(\mathcal{U}),$$

for $\mathcal{U}$ some measurable set in $\mathcal{M}$, in terms of the measures

$$\alpha_K(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \inf \Big\{ \alpha\big[\Gamma - \tilde{\Gamma}\big](\mathcal{U}) \;\Big|\; \tilde{\Gamma} \in C^{0,1} \text{ a } (1,2) - \text{tensor with } \|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{C^{0,1}} < K \Big\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The curvature scalar α now gives the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *A connection Γ can be smoothed in some open set $\mathcal{U}$ if and only if there exists a constant $K \geq$ such that $\alpha_K(\mathcal{U}) = 0$.*

Assuming the existence of a regularity singularity, Theorem 1.4 suggests that α could serve as some sort of index on the "strength" of the singularity.

The coordinate construction in the proof of Theorem 1.1 can be generalized to the case of non-zero Riemann curvature and the resulting coordinate system can be shown to be a locally inertial frame, as recorded in the next theorem. However, the construction only suffices to give the necessary Lipschitz control of the connection at p in two dimensions.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is manifold endowed with a symmetric BV-connection with Riemann curvature bounded in L^∞. Assume further $\mathcal{M}$ is two dimensional. Then, given a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists locally inertial coordinates at p within the atlas of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations, in the sense that in y^α the connection $\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma}$ vanishes at p and is Lipschitz continuous at p.*

The Riemann tensor being free of delta function sources and thus bounded in L^∞ is the most natural setting for the theory of shock wave in GR [8, 15]. The Lipschitz continuity of $\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma}$ at p is necessary and sufficient to remove the Coriolis terms introduced in [13]. Theorem 1.5 thus proves that Coriolis terms are removable and that no strong regularity singularities exist in two dimensional spacetimes. Whether (weak) regularity singularities exist in two dimensions is still an open question.

2. Preliminaries

The space of functions of (locally) bounded variation (BV) over some open subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$, contains all locally integrable functions over Ω such that their weak derivatives (in a distributional sense) are Radon measures on Ω, that is, for $f \in \mathrm{BV}(\Omega)$ there exist radon measures $\mu_i(f)$, $i = 1, ..., n$, such that

$$-\int_\Omega f \partial_i \psi \, d^n x = \int_\Omega f \psi \, \mu_i(f)$$

for any test function $\psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. (See [3] for a short introduction to the theory of BV functions and [17] for a more thorough one).

We here assume a n-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}$ endowed with a symmetric connection Γ which is not necessarily a metric connection, such that in some coordinate system x^i each component Γ^k_{ij} is a BV function with the L^∞-bound (1.1). We then consider the atlas $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformation which have second derivatives in BV, which is the largest atlas within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas that preserves the BV structure of the connection under the transformation law

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = J^k_\alpha \, \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} J^\beta_i J^\gamma_j + J^k_\alpha \, \frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}, \tag{2.1}$$

for a coordinate transformation $y \circ x^{-1}$ with Jacobian $J^\alpha_i \equiv \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i}$ and its inverse J^i_α. We are going to explain the role of the atlas of $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformations for GR shock waves in the end of this section.

From the connections being assumed in BV, it follows that each component $R^k{}_{lij}$ of the Riemann curvature tensor of Γ^k_{ij}, Riem(Γ), is a Radon measure. To be precise, for a smooth connection the coefficients of Riem(Γ) are

$$R^k{}_{lij} \equiv \Gamma^k_{l[j,i]} + [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j]^k_l, \tag{2.2}$$

for Γ_i denoting the matrix $\Gamma_i \equiv \left(\Gamma^k_{ij}\right)_{k,j=1,\dots,n}$ and for the "curl"- and "commutator"-terms

$$\Gamma^k_{l[j,i]} \equiv \Gamma^k_{lj,i} - \Gamma^k_{li,j} \qquad \text{and} \qquad [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j]^k_l \equiv \Gamma^k_{i\sigma}\Gamma^\sigma_{jl} - \Gamma^k_{j\sigma}\Gamma^\sigma_{il}. \tag{2.3}$$

For a BV connection Γ, the components of the Riemann curvature tensor are the Radon measures

$$\mathcal{R}^k{}_{lij} \equiv \mu_i\left(\Gamma^k_{lj}\right) - \mu_j\left(\Gamma^k_{li}\right) + [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j]^k_l \, dx, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mu_j(\Gamma^k_{li})$ denotes the measure associated with the x^j-derivative of the connection component Γ^k_{li} and dx is standard Lebesgue measure. It follows that

$$\int \psi \mathcal{R}^k{}_{lij} = -\int \left(\Gamma^k_{lj}\psi_{,i} - \Gamma^k_{li}\psi_{,j}\right) dx + \int [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j]^k_l \psi \, dx, \tag{2.5}$$

giving the weak formulation of the Riemann curvature tensor applied to test functions $\psi \in C^\infty_0$, where integration is always assumed to be over open sets containing the closure of the support of the test function, unless otherwise stated. We will mostly denote the measures $\mathcal{R}^k{}_{lij}$ again by $R^k{}_{lij}$.

The $C^{1,1}$ atlas is the most natural atlas for shock wave solutions of the Einstein equations, since it preserves the Riemann curvature tensor being free of delta function sources and since it holds the possibility of smoothing the metric [8, 12]. In more detail, it was proven in [15] that the weak formulation of the Einstein equations $G = \kappa T$ is invariant under the atlas of $C^{1,1}$ transformations and the lack of smoothness is enough to map a metric with $C^{1,1}$ components g_{ij} in coordinate system x, to corresponding components $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial y^\alpha}\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial y^\beta} g_{ij}$ which are only $C^{0,1}$ in the transformed coordinates y. That is, because the Jacobian of a $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformation is in general only $C^{0,1}$, such transformations will introduce delta function sources into the second derivatives of the transformed components of g, but interestingly, these will cancel out in G and R so long as they were not present in the original coordinates. To be precise, the result from [15] is recorded in the following theorem. For this, let $L[g]$ denote the second order partial differential operator on the components of g defined by the Riemann curvature tensor R in (2.2) and let $\mathcal{R}$ denote a real valued tensor containing no delta function sources.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an L^∞ weak solution of $\mathcal{R} = L[g]$ in x-coordinates. Then $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial y^\alpha}\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial y^\beta} g_{ij}$ is a weak solution of*

$$L[\tilde{g}] = \mathcal{R}\frac{\partial x}{\partial y}$$

for any coordinate system y related to x by a $C^{1,1}$ coordinate transformation, where we use the short-hand notation

$$\mathcal{R}\frac{\partial x}{\partial y} = \mathcal{R}^i_{jkl}\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial y^\beta}\frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\gamma}\frac{\partial x^l}{\partial y^\delta}\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i},$$

and multiplication by a function is taken in the weak sense.

3. A Geometric Equivalence for Smoothing BV Connections

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.1:** Note first that the splitting of Γ^k_{ij} into a connection and a $(1,2)$-tensor is consistent with the covariant transformation law (2.1), because the difference between two connections is always a tensor, c.f. [7]. That is, assuming $\hat{\Gamma}$ transforms under a coordinate transformation $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1}$ by the transformation rule of a connection,

$$\hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = \left\{ \hat{\Gamma}^i_{jk} J^j_\beta J^k_\gamma J^\alpha_i + J^\alpha_i \frac{\partial^2 x^i}{\partial y^\beta y^\gamma} \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ transforms by the transformation law of a tensor,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} J^j_\beta J^k_\gamma J^\alpha_i,$$

it follows that $\Gamma \equiv \tilde{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}$ transforms as a connection,

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} J^j_\beta J^k_\gamma J^\alpha_i + \left\{ \hat{\Gamma}^i_{jk} J^j_\beta J^k_\gamma J^\alpha_i + J^\alpha_i \frac{\partial^2 x^i}{\partial y^\beta y^\gamma} \right\}, \tag{3.2}$$

that is, by the transformation law (2.1), where $J^\alpha_k \equiv \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k}$ is the Jacobian and $J^k_\alpha \equiv \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\alpha}$ its inverse.

For the reverse implication, assume there exists a splitting $\Gamma^k_{ij} = \tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij} + \hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij}$ in a neighborhood of p with $\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij} \in C^{0,1}$ a $(1,2)$-tensor and with $\hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij} \in BV$ a connection such that $\mathrm{Riem}(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0$. Since $\hat{\Gamma}$ is assumed to be a connection which is in BV with $\mathrm{Riem}(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0$, Theorem 1.2 below implies that there exists a coordinate transformation $y \circ x^{-1}$ within the atlas $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ such that in y-coordinates

$$\hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = 0$$

almost everywhere in a neighborhood of p. Restricting without loss of generality to the continuous representation of the L^∞ function $\hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}$, we conclude that $\hat{\Gamma}^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}$ vanishes point-wise *everywhere*. Thus, by (3.1) and (3.2), we have in y-coordinates that

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} J^j_\beta J^k_\gamma J^\alpha_i \ \in C^{0,1}$$

which proves the reverse implication.

For the forward implication, assume there exists a transformation $y \circ x^{-1} \in C^{1,1}_{BV}$ such that $\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \in C^{0,1}$ in y-coordinates in some neighborhood of p. In

this case, considering

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} J^\beta_i J^\gamma_j J^k_\alpha + J^k_\alpha \frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}, \tag{3.3}$$

we define

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij} \equiv \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} J^\beta_j J^\gamma_i J^k_\alpha \ \in C^{0,1}$$

as the Lipschitz continuous tensor part of Γ^k_{ij} and

$$\hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij} \equiv J^k_\alpha \frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \tag{3.4}$$

as the BV connection part. The right hand side of (3.4) is flat, satisfying $\mathrm{Riem}(\hat{\Gamma}) = 0$ in a neighborhood of p, because it is the y-coordinate representation of the zero connection in x-coordinates. In more detail, taking the curl of (3.4) in the weak sense (2.5), the third order derivatives cancel and we obtain

$$-\int J^k_\alpha \left(y^\alpha_{,lj} \psi_{,i} - y^\alpha_{,li} \psi_{,j} \right) dx = \int \left(J^k_{\alpha,i} y^\alpha_{,lj} - J^k_{\alpha,j} y^\alpha_{,li} \right) \psi dx,$$

where a comma denotes differentiation with respect to x. Thus, the components of the Riemann curvature tensor of (3.4) are in fact given by the L^∞ functions

$$R^k_{lij} = J^k_{\alpha,i} y^\alpha_{,lj} - J^k_{\alpha,j} y^\alpha_{,li} + \Gamma^k_{im}\Gamma^m_{jl} - \Gamma^k_{jm}\Gamma^m_{il}.$$

Using now that $J^\gamma_k J^k_{\alpha,i} = -J^\gamma_{k,i} J^k_\alpha = -y^\gamma_{,ki} J^k_\alpha$, it follows that

$$J^\gamma_k R^k_{lij} = -y^\gamma_{,ki} J^k_\alpha y^\alpha_{,lj} + y^\gamma_{,kj} J^k_\alpha y^\alpha_{,li} + J^\gamma_k \Gamma^k_{i\sigma}\Gamma^\sigma_{jl} - J^\gamma_k \Gamma^k_{j\sigma}\Gamma^\sigma_{il}.$$

Finally substituting (3.4) for the remaining Γ's, the above terms mutually cancel to give $J^\gamma_k R^k_{lij} = 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2:** The reverse implication follows immediately, since the Riemann curvature tensor for a zero L^∞ connection vanishes in the weak sense, (2.4) -(2.5), and since (by Theorem 2.1) the Riemann curvature tensor of an L^∞ connection transforms covariantly by contraction with $C^{0,1}$ Jacobians. Thus, the Riemann curvature tensor of a zero L^∞ connections remains zero (in the weak sense) in every coordinate system within the $C^{1,1}$ atlas.

For the forward implication, assume a BV connection $\Gamma^k_{ij}(x)$ given in coordinates x^i defined on some neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$, such that $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma) = 0$. (For simplicity, we subsequently write Γ^k_{ij} instead of $\hat{\Gamma}^k_{ij}$.) For the proof we carefully extend the argument for smooth connections (c.f. [16]) to the weaker setting of connections being only in BV. In summary, the argument is as follows: We use the zero curvature condition to construct four independent 1-forms $\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_j dx^j$, $(\alpha = 1, ..., n)$, which are *parallel* in every direction

in $x(\mathcal{U})$ in a suitable L^1-sense. Using the parallel condition we construct coordinates $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1} \in C^{1,1}_{BV}$, with the property that

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j} = \omega^\alpha_j.$$

The 1-forms being parallel in every direction (i.e., $\nabla_X \omega^\alpha = 0$ for any tangent vector X) then further implies

$$\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \frac{\partial \omega^\alpha_j}{\partial x^i} = \Gamma^k_{ij} \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k}$$

almost everywhere. Thus, substituting the previous equation into the transformation law (2.1) yields

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = \Gamma^k_{ij} + \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial y^\gamma}{\partial x^j} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\alpha}, \tag{3.5}$$

which already implies that $\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma} = 0$ almost everywhere. In the remainder of this section we give the detailed proofs behind the steps just outlined.

To begin, we state the main step about the existence of parallel 1-forms in a lemma and then show how to construct the sought after coordinates y. For this, without loss of generality, we assume from hereon that the coordinate neighborhood $x(\mathcal{U})$ is an n-cube given by the cross product of n intervals,

$$x(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{I}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{I}_n, \qquad \mathcal{I}_k = (a_k, b_k), \qquad a_k < 0 < b_k,$$

and we introduce for each $l = 1, ..., n$ the subsets

$$\Omega_l \equiv \mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_l \times \{0\}^{n-l}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Assume Γ is a symmetric connection of zero Riemann curvature with BV x-components $\Gamma^k_{ij}(x)$, $x \in x(\mathcal{U})$, satisfying the L^∞ bound (1.1). Then there exist n linearly independent 1-forms $\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_i dx^i$, $\alpha = 1, ..., n$, such that the components $\omega^\alpha_i(x)$ are Lipschitz continuous functions of x with derivatives in BV and such that the ω^α are L^1-parallel[2] in every direction in the sense that*

$$\|\nabla_X \omega^\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega_l)} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{I}_1} ... \int_{\mathcal{I}_l} |\nabla_X \omega^\alpha|(x^1, ..., x^l, 0, ..., 0) dx^1 ... dx^l \;=\; 0 \tag{3.6}$$

for each $l = 1, ..., n$ and for every vector $X \in T_x\mathcal{M}$.

We first show that Lemma 3.1 implies Theorem 1.2, and give its proof in Section 3.3. Assuming Lemma 3.1 holds, a simple computation shows that the ω^α being L^1-parallel implies ω^α to be exact almost everywhere. That is,

$$d\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_{i,j}\, dx^i \wedge dx^j = 0, \qquad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_l,$$

[2]Let us clarify our notion "L^1-parallel": (3.6) implies that the 1-forms ω^α are parallel in an L^1 sense on each of the surfaces spanned by the coordinate axes through the origin. That the L^1 parallel property holds with respect to the origin can always be arranged for at the start by a coordinate translation. In particular, it is $\|\nabla_X w^\alpha\|_{L^1(x(\mathcal{U}))} = 0$.

because (3.6) together with the symmetry $\Gamma^k_{ij} = \Gamma^k_{ji}$ implies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\omega^\alpha_j = \Gamma^k_{ij}\omega^\alpha_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\omega^\alpha_i, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega_l, \tag{3.7}$$

point-wise *almost everywhere* with respect to Lebesque measure on the subsets Ω_l for each $l = 1, ..., n$.

We now prove Poincare's Lemma for BV connections and Lipschitz continuous 1-forms, that is, we prove that there exist $C^{1,1}$ functions $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1} \in C^{1,1}_{BV}$, $\alpha = 1, ..., n$, such that

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j} = \omega^\alpha_j. \tag{3.8}$$

To begin, we define

$$\begin{aligned} y^\alpha(x^1, ..., x^n) &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{x^i} \omega^\alpha_i(x^1, ..., x^{i-1}, t, 0, ..., 0)dt \qquad (3.9)\\ &= \int_0^{x^n} \omega^\alpha_n(x^1, ..., x^{n-1}, t)dt + ... + \int_0^{x^1} \omega^\alpha_1(t, 0, ..., 0)dt. \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately that (3.8) holds for differentiation in $j = n$ and that $y^\alpha \in C^{0,1}(x(\mathcal{U}))$ with derivatives in BV. Poincare's Lemma for BV connection follows once we prove the following

Claim: Assume the ω^α are L^1-parallel in the sense of (3.6), then the functions $y^\alpha \circ x^{-1}$ defined in (3.9) lie in the atlas $C^{1,1}_{BV}$ and satisfy (3.8) *point-wise* for each $j = 1, ..., n-1$.

Proof of Claim: If Γ^k_{ij} and ω^α were smooth, (3.7) would hold point-wise and we could easily verify (3.8) as follows: Differentiating (3.9) gives

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}(x^1, ..., x^n) = \sum_{i=j+1}^n \int_0^{x^i} \frac{\partial \omega^\alpha_i}{\partial x^j}(x^1, ..., x^{i-1}, t, 0, ..., 0)dt + \omega^\alpha_j(x^1, ..., x^j, 0, ..., 0) \tag{3.10}$$

and using that (3.7) now holds point-wise yields

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}(x^1, ..., x^n) = \sum_{i=j+1}^n \int_0^{x^i} \frac{\partial \omega^\alpha_j}{\partial x^i}(x^1, ..., x^{i-1}, t, 0, ..., 0)dt + \omega^\alpha_j(x^1, ..., x^j, 0, ..., 0). \tag{3.11}$$

From the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, observing that boundary terms of the integrals mutually cancel, we find the sought after identity

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}(x^1, ..., x^n) = \omega^\alpha_j(x^1, ..., x^n). \tag{3.12}$$

To adapt this argument to the low regularity, the step from (3.10) to (3.11) must be modified to accommodate that (3.7) only holds in an almost everywhere sense. For this, we integrate the expressions in (3.10) - (3.12) as follows: We first introduce for notational convenience

$$\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{I}_1} ... \int_{\mathcal{I}_n} \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j} dx^1 ... dx^n.$$

(Note that the L^∞ functions $\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}$ are integrable over the pre-compact set $x(\mathcal{U})$.) We now obtain from (3.9) similarly to the computation (3.10), omitting the j-th boundary term $\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^j,0,...,0)$ for convenience, that

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} &= \int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_n}\sum_{i=j+1}^{n}\int_0^{x^i}\frac{\partial \omega_i^\alpha}{\partial x^j}(x^1,...,x^{i-1},t,0,...,0)dt\,dx^1...dx^n \\ = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n}\int_{\mathcal{I}_i}&\left(\int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_{i-1}}\int_0^{x^i}\frac{\partial \omega_i^\alpha}{\partial x^j}(x^1,...,x^{i-1},t,0,...,0)dtdx^1...dx^{i-1}\right)dx^i \\ &\cdot vol(\mathcal{I}_{i+1}\times...\times\mathcal{I}_n)\end{aligned}$$

Using now that ω^α is L^1-parallel, so that (3.7) holds almost everywhere, we find that the derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ commutes with the i-th components of ω^α in the integral in parenthesis, which gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n}\int_{\mathcal{I}_i}&\left(\int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_{i-1}}\int_0^{x^i}\frac{\partial \omega_j^\alpha}{\partial x^i}(x^1,...,x^{i-1},t,0,...,0)dtdx^1...dx^{i-1}\right)dx^i \\ &\cdot vol(\mathcal{I}_{i+1}\times...\times\mathcal{I}_n).\end{aligned}$$

Applying now the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus for the absolute continuous function ω_j^α,

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n}&\int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_i}\left[\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^{i-1},t,0,...,0)\right]_0^{x^i}dx^1...dx^i \\ &\cdot vol(\mathcal{I}_{i+1}\times...\times\mathcal{I}_n).\end{aligned}$$

Including again the j-th boundary term $\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^j,0,...,0)$, we write the above equation as

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n}&\int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_n}\left[\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^{i-1},t,0,...,0)\right]_0^{x^i}dx^1...dx^n \\ &+\int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_n}\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^j,0,...,0)dx^1...dx^n.\end{aligned}$$

As in the initial computation (3.10), the boundary terms cancel in the above summation, finally leading to

$$\left[\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}\right]_{L^1} = \int_{\mathcal{I}_1}...\int_{\mathcal{I}_n}\omega_j^\alpha(x^1,...,x^n)dx^1...dx^n,$$

which we write equivalently as

$$\left\|\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}-\omega_j^\alpha\right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times...\times\mathcal{I}_n)}=0.$$

Now, since $\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}$ and ω_j^α agree as L^1 functions over $x(\mathcal{U})$, it follows that the j-th weak derivative of y^α is given by the $C^{0,1}$ function ω_j^α for each $j=1,...,n$. Therefore $y^\alpha\in C^{1,1}\big(x(\mathcal{U})\big)$ and $\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^j}=\omega_j^\alpha$ point-wise everywhere in $\mathcal{U}$, which proves (3.8) and Poincare's Lemma for BV connections and Lipschitz continuous 1-forms. This completes the proof of the claim. □

The independence of the 1-forms ω^α, for $\alpha = 1, ..., n$, now implies $x \to y$ to be an invertible map on $x(\mathcal{U})$, with non-singular Jacobian $\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i} \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{U})$. In y-coordinates, the components of Γ are given by

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 y^\sigma}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}\frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\sigma} + \Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\gamma} \tag{3.13}$$

almost everywhere in $x(\mathcal{U})$. But by (3.8) and by the ω^α being parallel in the sense of (3.7), we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 y^\sigma}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\omega^\sigma_j = \Gamma^l_{ij}\omega^\sigma_l = \Gamma^l_{ij}\frac{\partial y^\sigma}{\partial x^l}$$

almost everywhere in $x(\mathcal{U})$. Substituting this into (3.13) gives

$$\Gamma^k_{ij} = \Gamma^k_{ij} + \Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial x^k}{\partial y^\gamma}, \tag{3.14}$$

which together with the Jacobian $\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^i}$ being non-singular implies

$$\Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta} = 0$$

almost everywhere in $x(\mathcal{U})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 once we prove Lemma 3.1, subject to the next subsection. □

3.3. **Proof of Lemma 3.1:** To construct the n linearly independent 1-forms $\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_i\, dx^i$ which are L^1 parallel in the sense of (3.6), we consider a standard mollification of $\Gamma^k_{ij}(x)$,

$$(\Gamma_\epsilon)^k_{ij}(x) = \int_{x(\mathcal{U})} \Gamma^k_{ij}(\tilde{x})\phi_\epsilon(x - \tilde{x})d\tilde{x}, \tag{3.15}$$

with a mollifier $\phi \in C^\infty_0\big(x(\mathcal{U})\big)$ and we again assume fixed coordinates x^i on $x(\mathcal{U})$. Then $\Gamma_\epsilon \in C^\infty$, and

$$|\Gamma_\epsilon(x)| \leq \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty}\left|\int \phi_\epsilon(x - \tilde{x})d\tilde{x}\right| = \|\Gamma\|_{L^\infty},$$

so that the L^∞ bound on Γ, (1.1), implies

$$\|\,(\Gamma_\epsilon)^k_{ij}\,\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\Gamma^k_{ij}\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_0, \tag{3.16}$$

for M_0 the ϵ independent constant in (1.1).

Before we begin constructing the 1-forms $\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_i\, dx^i$, we prove the following three claims about the curvature.

Claim 1: The supremums norm of $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon)$ is bounded independent of ϵ by $\|\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\|\Gamma\|^2_{L^\infty} \leq 2M_0^2$.

Proof of Claim 1: Supressing indices, the curvature of Γ_ϵ can be written in short-hand notation as a curl plus a commutator, c.f. (2.2) - (2.3),

$$\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon) \quad \equiv \quad Curl(\Gamma_\epsilon) + [\Gamma_\epsilon, \Gamma_\epsilon]. \tag{3.17}$$

For the mollified "curl-part", observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\Gamma_\epsilon(x) &= \int \Gamma(\tilde{x})\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\phi_\epsilon(x-\tilde{x})d\tilde{x} \\ &= -\int \Gamma(\tilde{x})\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}^j}\phi_\epsilon(x-\tilde{x})d\tilde{x} = \int \mu_j\big(\Gamma\big)\phi_\epsilon(x-\cdot)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_j\big(\Gamma\big)$ denotes the Radon measure of the x^j-derivative of the BV function Γ. We thus find that

$$Curl_x(\Gamma_\epsilon)(x) = \int Curl(\Gamma)\phi_\epsilon(x-\cdot)\ , \tag{3.18}$$

where the curl on Γ is defined as the Radon measure $\big(Curl(\Gamma)\big)^k_{ijl} = \mu_j\big(\Gamma^k_{il}\big) - \mu_l\big(\Gamma^k_{ij}\big)$, c.f. (2.4). Using now our incoming assumption that $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma) = 0$, we replace the above curl by the "commutator-part" in (2.3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}Curl_x(\Gamma_\epsilon)(x) &= -\int [\Gamma,\Gamma](\tilde{x})\phi_\epsilon(x-\tilde{x})d\tilde{x} \\ &= -[\Gamma,\Gamma]_\epsilon(x).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in light of (3.17), we have shown that

$$\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon) = -[\Gamma,\Gamma]_\epsilon + [\Gamma_\epsilon,\Gamma_\epsilon],$$

and since $[\Gamma,\Gamma]$ is again in L^∞ an estimate similar to (3.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty} &\le \big(\|[\Gamma,\Gamma]_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Gamma_\epsilon\|^2_{L^\infty}\big) \\ &\le \big(\|[\Gamma,\Gamma]\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Gamma\|^2_{L^\infty}\big) \\ &\le 2\|\Gamma\|^2_{L^\infty},\end{aligned}$$

verifying Claim 1. □

Claim 2: $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon) \longrightarrow 0$ in L^1 as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof of Claim 2: Multiplying each component of $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon)$, $(R_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}$, by a test-function $\psi \in C^\infty_0\big(x(\mathcal{U})\big)$ and integrating over $x(\mathcal{U})$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{x(\mathcal{U})} (R_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}\psi dx &= \int (\Gamma_\epsilon)^k{}_{l[j,i]}\psi dx + \int_{x(\mathcal{U})} [(\Gamma_\epsilon)_i,(\Gamma_\epsilon)_j]^k_l\,\psi\,dx \\ &= -\int_{x(\mathcal{U})} \big((\Gamma_\epsilon)^k{}_{lj}\psi_{,i} - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^k{}_{li}\psi_{,j}\big)\,dx + \int_{x(\mathcal{U})} [(\Gamma_\epsilon)_i,(\Gamma_\epsilon)_j]^k_l\,\psi\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Now, as ϵ approaches zero, $(\Gamma_\epsilon)^k{}_{ij} \to \Gamma^k{}_{ij}$ in L^1, so taking this limit in the last line of the previous equation and using that the test functions and their derivatives are bounded, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int (R_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}\psi dx &= -\int \big(\Gamma^k{}_{lj}\psi_{,i} - \Gamma^k{}_{li}\psi_{,j}\big)\,dx + \int [\Gamma_i,\Gamma_j]^k_l\psi dx \\ &= \int \psi\left\{\mu_i\big(\Gamma^k_{lj}\big) - \mu_j\big(\Gamma^k_{li}\big) + [\Gamma_i,\Gamma_j]^k_l dx\right\} \\ &= \int \psi\mathcal{R}^k{}_{lij} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition of the measure valued curvature (2.4) in the last line. This proves Claim 2. □

We will need the following claim to assign initial conditions for the construction of parallel 1-forms below.

Claim 3: For every sequence $\epsilon \to 0$ there exists a subsequence ϵ_k (with $\epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$) and some point $(\bar{x}^1, ..., \bar{x}^n) \in \mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n$ such that the mollified curvature satisfies the L^1 *peeling property* at $\bar{x} \equiv (\bar{x}^1, ..., \bar{x}^n)$, by which we mean that for each $m = 1, ..., n$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon_k \to 0} \int_{\mathcal{I}_1} ... \int_{\mathcal{I}_m} (R_{\epsilon_k})^k{}_{lij}(x^1, ..., x^m, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) dx^1 ... dx^m = 0, \qquad (3.19)$$

that is,

$$\left\| (R_{\epsilon_k})^k{}_{lij}(\cdot, ..., \cdot, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon_k \to 0.$$

Proof of Claim 3: Define $\tilde{x} \equiv (x^1, ..., x^m) \in \mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ and $\bar{x} \equiv (x^{m+1}, ..., x^n) \in \mathcal{I}_{m+1} \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n$. Fubini's Theorem implies that

$$(\bar{R}_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}(\bar{x}) \equiv \int_{\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m} (R_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}(\tilde{x}, \bar{x}) d\tilde{x}$$

is an integrable function over $\mathcal{I}_{m+1} \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n$. Since, $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma_\epsilon)$ converges to zero in $L^1(x(\mathcal{U}))$ by Claim 2, it follows that $(\bar{R}_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}$ converges to zero in $L^1(\mathcal{I}_{m+1} \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n)$, namely

$$\int_{\mathcal{I}_{m+1} \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n} (\bar{R}_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}(\bar{x}) d\bar{x} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} (R_\epsilon)^k{}_{lij}\, dx \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \to 0.$$

Therefore, there exists a subsequence ϵ_k^m (with $\epsilon_k^m \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$) and some point $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{I}_{m+1} \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n$ at which $(\bar{R}_{\epsilon_k^m})^k{}_{lij}(\cdot)$ converges to zero as $k \to \infty$. For this point $\bar{x}$, it follows that $(R_{\epsilon_k^m})^k{}_{lij}(\cdot, \bar{x})$ converges to 0 in $L^1(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m \times \{\bar{x}\})$ as $k \to \infty$.

Now, applying this construction with respect to $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_n$, we first find a point $\bar{x}^n \in \mathcal{I}_n$ together with a subsequence ϵ_k^{n-1} of ϵ such that

$$(R_{\epsilon_k^{n-1}})^k{}_{lij}(\,\cdot\,, \bar{x}^n) \longrightarrow 0, \qquad \text{in } L^1(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_{n-1}), \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Given this convergence on the $n-1$ sub-cube $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_{n-1} \times \{\bar{x}^n\}$, we again apply the above construction (but now with respect to the sub-cube) to obtain a point $\bar{x}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{I}_{n-1}$ and a subsequence ϵ_k^{n-2} of ϵ_k^{n-1} such that

$$(R_{\epsilon_k^{n-2}})^k{}_{lij}(\,\cdot\,, \bar{x}^{n-1}, \bar{x}^n) \longrightarrow 0, \qquad \text{in } L^1(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_{n-2}), \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Continuing, we successively find a subsequence ϵ_k of ϵ and a point $(\bar{x}^1, ..., \bar{x}^n) \in x(\mathcal{U})$ at which the peeling property (3.19) holds. This proves Claim 3. □

The idea now is to construct n linearly independent 1-forms $\omega_\epsilon^\alpha = (\omega_\epsilon^\alpha)_i\, dx^i$, $\alpha = 1, ..., n$, of the mollified connections Γ_ϵ by parallel translating in x-coordinate directions $\mathbf{e}_1, ..., \mathbf{e}_n$, one direction at a time, starting with initial data given at a point of peeling to control the L^1-norms of the curvature at

the initial data. The resulting 1-forms $\omega_\epsilon^\alpha = (\omega_\epsilon^\alpha)_i\, dx^i$, will not be parallel in every direction because the curvature of the mollified connections is in general nonzero. However, since the Riemann curvature converges to zero in L^1 as $\epsilon \to 0$, a careful analysis of the subsequent construction allows us to prove that the ω_ϵ^α tend to parallel 1-forms in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$, once their convergence in $C^{0,1}$ has been shown. Concerning this convergence, the uniform L^∞ bound on the curvature alone will imply that the resulting 1-forms are Lipschitz continuous *uniformly* in ϵ, so that the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem yields a convergent subsequence of the 1-forms ω_ϵ^α that converge to Lipschitz continuous 1-forms $\omega_i^1 dx^i, ..., \omega_i^n dx^i$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

To begin, assume a sequence $\epsilon \to 0$ such that the curvature satisfies the peeling property (3.19) at the point $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}^1, ..., \bar{x}^n)$. Assume without loss of generality that $\bar{x} = (0, ..., 0)$, and $\mathcal{I}_k = (-1, 1) \equiv \mathcal{I}$ for each $k = 1, ..., n$. We begin with the construction of 1-forms on the two-surface $\mathcal{I}_1 \times \mathcal{I}_2 \times \{\bar{x}^3\} \times ... \times \{\bar{x}^n\}$ which are parallel in the x^2-direction, and then extend to $(x^1, ..., x^n) \in x(\mathcal{U})$ by induction, in the following four steps:

Step (i): First solve for 1-forms $\omega_\epsilon^\alpha = (\omega_\epsilon^\alpha)_j dx^j$, for $\alpha = 1, ..., n$, parallel along the x^1-axis. I.e., solve the ODE initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_1 \left(\omega_\epsilon^\alpha\right)_j (x^1, 0) &\equiv \frac{\partial \left(\omega_\epsilon^\alpha\right)_j}{\partial x^1}(x^1, 0) - \left(\Gamma_\epsilon\right)_{1j}^k \left(\omega_\epsilon^\alpha\right)_k (x^1, 0) = 0, \quad (3.20) \\ \left(\omega_\epsilon^\alpha\right)(0, 0) &= \mathbf{e}^\alpha, \quad (3.21) \end{aligned}$$

where we suppress the dependence on $(\bar{x}^3, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ which are fixed. Since we seek independent 1-forms, we choose the initial data for the 1-forms at the point $(0, 0)$ to be the n-independent coordinate covectors $\mathbf{e}^\alpha \equiv dx^\alpha$. For the construction it suffices to keep α fixed and, for ease of notation, we subsequently write $\omega^\epsilon \equiv \omega_i^\epsilon dx^i$ instead of $\omega_\epsilon^\alpha \equiv (\omega_\epsilon^\alpha)_i dx^i$.

Now taking $t = x^1$, (3.20)-(3.21) is an initial value problem for an ODE of the form

$$\dot{u} + A_\epsilon u = 0$$

with $u(t) = (\omega_1^\epsilon(t, 0), ..., \omega_n^\epsilon(t, 0)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $(A_\epsilon)_j^k(t) = \left(\Gamma_\epsilon\right)_{1j}^k (t, 0)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix which is smooth and bounded in the L^∞ norm, uniformly in ϵ, by (3.16). Thus the Picard-Lindelöff existence theorem for ODE's implies that there exists a unique smooth solution $\omega^\epsilon(t, 0)$. Moreover, the Grönwall inequality together with the L^∞ bound on A_ϵ imply the resulting 1-forms $\omega^\epsilon(t, 0) = \omega^\epsilon(x^1, \bar{x}^2, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ to be bounded, uniformly in ϵ, which then yields Lipschitz continuity in the x^1-direction, uniformly in ϵ.

Step (ii): Now given the $\omega^\epsilon(x^1, 0)$ from step (i), assume for simplicity $\omega^\epsilon(x^1, 0)$ exists for all $x^1 \in (-1, 1)$, use $\omega^\epsilon(x^1, 0)$ as initial data to solve for the parallel transport in the x^2-direction starting from $x^2 = 0$, by solving the ODE initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_2 \omega_j^\epsilon(x^1, x^2) &\equiv \frac{\partial \omega_j^\epsilon}{\partial x^2}(x^1, x^2) - \left(\Gamma_\epsilon\right)_{2j}^k \omega_k^\epsilon(x^1, x^2) = 0, \quad (3.22) \\ \omega^\epsilon(x^1, x^2) &= \omega^\epsilon(x^1, 0) \quad \text{at} \quad x^2 = 0. \quad (3.23) \end{aligned}$$

For fixed $x^1 \in (-1,1)$, taking $t = x^2$, (3.22)-(3.23) is an initial value problem for an ODE of the form

$$\dot{u} + A_\epsilon u = 0, \tag{3.24}$$

with $u(t) = \omega^\epsilon(x^1,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(A_\epsilon)^k_j(t) = (\Gamma_\epsilon)^k_{2j}(x^1,t)$ an $n \times n$ matrix which is smooth and bounded in the supnorm uniformly in ϵ, according to (3.16). The Picard-Lindelöff theorem implies that there exists a unique smooth solution $\omega^\epsilon(x^1,t)$, and for ease we again assume $\omega^\epsilon(x^1,t)$ to be defined throughout the interval $-1 < t < 1$ for each $x^1 \in (-1,1)$. The ϵ-independent supnorm bound $\|A_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_0$ on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times \mathcal{I}_2$, together with the Grönwall inequality for (3.24), imply the supnorm bound

$$\|\omega^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq K_0, \quad \text{ on } \ \mathcal{I}_1 \times \mathcal{I}_2, \tag{3.25}$$

for K_0 a constant independent of ϵ. Moreover, $\|A_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq M_0$ implies the $\omega^\epsilon(x^1,x^2) \equiv \omega^\epsilon(x^1,x^2,\bar{x}^3,...,\bar{x}^n)$ to satisfy a Lipschitz bound in the x^2-direction, independent of x^1 and ϵ. But, we still need to control the Lipschitz bound in the x^1-direction, which is accomplished in Step (iii).

Step (iii): In (ii) we constructed $\omega^\epsilon(x^1,x^2)$ parallel in x^2 for each fixed $x^1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$, (i.e., $\nabla_2 \omega^\epsilon = 0$), which gives Lipschitz continuity in x^2-direction uniform in ϵ and x^1. Now, to get Lipschitz continuity in x^1-direction uniform in ϵ and x^2, we estimate the change of $u \equiv \nabla_1 \omega^\epsilon$ in x^2-direction, starting from $x^2 = 0$ where we know that $u \equiv \nabla_1 \omega^\epsilon(x^1,0) = 0$ by construction.

To obtain the equation for the change in x^2-direction, use the definition of curvature to write

$$\nabla_2 \left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}\right] \ = \ \nabla_1 \nabla_2 \omega^\epsilon_k + (R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{k21}\, \omega^\epsilon_\sigma. \tag{3.26}$$

The definition of covariant derivative gives us

$$\nabla_1 \nabla_2 \omega^\epsilon_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}\left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;2}\right] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{1k}\omega_{\sigma;2} - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{12}\omega^\epsilon_{k;\sigma}\ ,$$

and since $\omega_{\sigma;2} = 0$, we conclude that (3.26) is equivalent to

$$\nabla_2 \left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}\right] + (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{12}\omega^\epsilon_{k;\sigma} - (R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{k21}\, \omega^\epsilon_\sigma = 0. \tag{3.27}$$

Alternatively, using the definition of ∇_2 directly we have

$$\nabla_2 \left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}\right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}\left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}\right] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{2k}\omega^\epsilon_{\sigma;1} - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{21}\omega^\epsilon_{k;\sigma}\ . \tag{3.28}$$

Putting (3.28) into (3.27) and canceling the common term gives the ODE for $u \equiv \omega^\epsilon_{k;1}$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}\left[\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}\right] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{2k}\omega^\epsilon_{\sigma;1} - (R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{k21}\, \omega^\epsilon_\sigma = 0. \tag{3.29}$$

Thus, for fixed x^1, letting $t = x^2$ and

$$u_k(t) \equiv \omega^\epsilon_{k;1}(x^1,t),$$

the x^2-directional change of u is determined by the system of ODE's

$$\dot{u} + A_\epsilon u + B_\epsilon = 0, \tag{3.30}$$

where $u = (u_1, ..., u_n)$, and the $n \times n$-matrix A_ϵ as well as the n-vector B_ϵ are given by

$$(A_\epsilon)^\sigma_k = -\,(\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{2k} \qquad \text{and} \qquad (B_\epsilon)_k = -\,(R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{k21}\,\omega^\epsilon_\sigma.$$

In addition to the ϵ-independent bound on A_ϵ, we have by Claim 1 and (3.25) that

$$\|B_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|R_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\,\|\omega^\epsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty} \leq K_0, \tag{3.31}$$

where K_0 is a constant independent of ϵ and the L^∞-norm is taken on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times \mathcal{I}_2$. To apply the Grönwall inequlity, write (3.30) equivalently as the integral equation

$$u(t) = -\int_0^t B_\epsilon(s)ds - \int_0^t A_\epsilon(s)u(s)ds,$$

where we use that that the initial condition is zero at $x^2 = 0$, because parallel translation at $x^2 = 0$ holds for all $\epsilon > 0$. Taking the point-wise Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ gives

$$|u|(t) \leq \varphi(t) + \int_0^t |A_\epsilon|(s)|u|(s)ds, \qquad \text{for} \quad \varphi(t) \equiv \int_0^t |B_\epsilon|(s)ds,$$

where $|A_\epsilon|$ denotes the corresponding operator norm. Thus, the Grönwall inequality gives the estimate

$$|\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}|(t) \equiv\ |u|(t)\ \leq \varphi(t) + \int_0^t \varphi(s)\ |A_\epsilon|(s)\ \exp\Big(\int_s^t |A_\epsilon|(\tilde{s})d\tilde{s}\Big)ds,$$

which together with the bound on A_ϵ yields

$$|\omega^\epsilon_{k;1}|(t) \leq K\int_0^t |B_\epsilon|dt, \tag{3.32}$$

for $K > 0$ some universal constant independent of ϵ. Estimate (3.32) and (3.31) together with the definition of the covariant derivative, $\omega^\epsilon_{i;1} = \omega^\epsilon_{i,1} - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{i1}\,\omega^\epsilon_\sigma$, implies the supnorm of the derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}\omega^\epsilon$ to be bounded uniformly in ϵ by

$$\Big|\frac{\partial \omega^\epsilon_k}{\partial x^1}\Big|(t) \leq K\int_0^t |B_\epsilon|dt + \big|(\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{k1} w^\epsilon_\sigma\big|. \tag{3.33}$$

This implies that the components $\omega^\epsilon_i(x^1, x^2, \bar{x}^3, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ are Lipschitz continuous in (x^1, x^2), uniform in ϵ.

Step (iv): We now implement the induction step from $m-1$ to m with $m \leq n$. For this, let $\omega^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, \bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ be the 1-form $\omega^\epsilon(\cdot, \bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_{m-1})$ with $(\bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ fixed, which generalizes the construction in Step (i) - (ii) in the sense that it satisfies the parallel transport condition,

$$\nabla_k \omega^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^k, \bar{x}^{k+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) = 0, \tag{3.34}$$

for each $k \leq m-1$. Moreover, we assume for induction the Lipschitz bound for ω^ϵ to be uniform in ϵ, that is, we assume there exists some constant $K_{m-1} > 0$ independent of ϵ such that on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_{m-1} = (-1,1)^{m-1}$

$$Lip\big(\omega^\epsilon(\cdot, \bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n)\big) \leq K_{m-1}. \tag{3.35}$$

The induction step now is to prove that there exists a 1-form $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m)$ which agrees with ω^ϵ when $x^m = \bar{x}^m$, and which satisfies the Lipschitz bound (3.35) on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m = (-1,1)^m$ for some constant $K_m > 0$ independent of ϵ, and such that for each $k \leq m$, the parallel transport condition (3.34) holds.

To begin, generalizing step (ii), we extend ω^ϵ, to $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^m, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ for all values of $x^m \in \mathcal{I}_m$ by solving the ODE for parallel transporting ω^ϵ in the direction of x^m, using values of $\omega^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, \bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n)$ as initial data. That is, we solve the ODE

$$\nabla_m \hat{\omega}^\epsilon(x^1 ..., x^m, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) = 0, \tag{3.36}$$

for fixed $x^1, ..., x^{m-1}$, taking as initial data at $\bar{x}^m = 0$,

$$\hat{\omega}^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, 0, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) = \omega^\epsilon(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, \bar{x}^m, ..., \bar{x}^n).$$

(Recall, without loss of generality, we have taken $\bar{x}^k = 0$, $k = 1, ..., n$.) Similar to Step (ii), solving the above ODE gives a 1-form $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m)$ and the parallel condition (3.34) for $k \leq m$ is satisfied by construction. Moreover, the Grönwall inequality implies that $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon$ is sup-norm bounded over $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ and this bound is independent of ϵ by (3.16). The Lipschitz bound in the m-direction now follows from (3.36).

It remains to prove the ϵ-independent Lipschitz bound on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ in the j-direction for each $j < m$. For this, we proceed similarly to Step (iii) and use the definition of the curvature tensor to write for each $j < m$

$$\nabla_m \nabla_j \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_k = \nabla_j \nabla_m \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_k + (R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{kmj} \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_\sigma. \tag{3.37}$$

Computing the components of the covariant derivatives in (3.37) in terms of their connection coefficients, using that $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{j;m} = 0$ for all $j = 1, .., n$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_j \nabla_m \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_k &= \partial_j[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;m}] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{jk}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{\sigma;m}] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{jm}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;\sigma}] \\ &= -(\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{jm}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;\sigma}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\nabla_m \nabla_j \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_k = \partial_m[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;j}] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{mk}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{\sigma;j}] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{mj}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;\sigma}].$$

Substituting the previous two identities into (3.37), we find that (3.37) is equivalent to the system of ODE's

$$\partial_m[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;j}] - (\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{mk}[\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{\sigma;j}] - (R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{kmj} \hat{\omega}^\epsilon_\sigma = 0. \tag{3.38}$$

Taking as initial data

$$\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;j}(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, 0, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n) = \omega^\epsilon_{k;j}(x^1, ..., x^{m-1}, \bar{x}^m, \bar{x}^{m+1}, ..., \bar{x}^n),$$

for the ODE (3.38), the induction assumption of the Lipschitz bound (3.35) together with the Grönwall inequality leads to the estimate

$$|\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_{k;j}|(x^1,...,x^m,\bar{x}^{m+1},...,\bar{x}^n) \\ \leq K_0 \int_{\mathcal{I}_m} |(R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{kmj}\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_\sigma| dx^m + |\omega^\epsilon_{k;j}|(x^1,...,x^{m-1},\bar{x}^m,...,\bar{x}^n), \quad (3.39)$$

for some constant $K_0 > 0$ which is independent of ϵ by the ϵ-independent bound on Γ_ϵ (3.16), similar to step (iii).[3]

The ϵ-independent Lipschitz bound for $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon$ on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ now follows directly from (3.39). Namely, $\|(R_\epsilon)^\sigma_{kmj}\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty}$ over $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ is bounded independent of ϵ by the curvature bound from Claim 1 and the bound on $\|\hat{\omega}^\epsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty}$ derived above. Moreover, by our induction assumption (3.35) on the Lipschitz constant of $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon$, it follows that the second term in (3.39) is bounded independent of ϵ by

$$\|\omega^\epsilon_{k;j}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1\times...\times\mathcal{I}_{m-1})} \ < \ K_{m-1} + \left\|(\Gamma_\epsilon)^\sigma_{kj} w^\epsilon_\sigma\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{I}_1\times...\times\mathcal{I}_{m-1})}.$$

We conclude that $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon$ satisfies the sought after Lipschitz bound of the form (3.35) on $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m = (-1,1)^m$ for some constant $K_m > 0$, independent of ϵ. This completes the induction step and, denoting the $\hat{\omega}^\epsilon$ again by ω^ϵ, proves that the 1-forms $\omega^\epsilon(x^1,...,x^n)$ are Lipschitz continuous, uniformly in ϵ. This completes Step (iv).

To summarize, in step (i) - (iv) we constructed n families of smooth 1-forms $(w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i dx^i$, (with $\alpha = 1,...,n$), such that each component has a Lipschitz bound independent of ϵ, that is,

$$\left\|(w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i\right\|_{L^\infty} \ + \ \left\|\frac{\partial (w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i}{\partial x^j}\right\|_{L^\infty} \ \leq \ K$$

for $K > 0$ some constant independent of ϵ. Thus, for each $\alpha = 1,...,n$, the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem yields a subsequence of the 1-forms $(w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i dx^i$ that converges uniformly to a Lipschitz continuous 1-form $\omega^\alpha_i dx^i$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Since for each $\alpha = 1,...,n$ the initial data in step (i) above was chosen such that each 1-form $(w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i dx^i$ agrees with the unit covector $\mathbf{e}^\alpha_k dx^k = dx^\alpha$ at the point $(\bar{x}^1,...,\bar{x}^n)$, the limit 1-form $\omega^\alpha_i dx^i$ is identical to dx^α at $(\bar{x}^1,...,\bar{x}^n)$ as well. Thus, the 1-forms $(w_\epsilon)^\alpha_i dx^i$ are linearly independent. Linear independence throughout $x(\mathcal{U})$ follows from the uniqueness result for ODE's, because these 1-forms are n solutions of a system of n ODE's with linearly independent initial data, c.f. (3.21).

It remains to prove that the limit 1-forms are L^1-parallel in every direction, with respect to Γ, in the sense of (3.6). For this, integrate the ODE estimate (3.39) over $\mathcal{I}_1 \times ... \times \mathcal{I}_m$ and use that ω^ϵ is sup-norm bounded

[3]The difference between the Grönwall estimate here and the one in step (iii) is the presence of the second term on the right hand side which is due to the initial data, because ω^ϵ is not parallel initially when $\epsilon \neq 0$, $k > 1$.

independent of ϵ (by a standard Grönwall estimate on (3.36)), to get

$$\|\hat{\omega}^{\epsilon}_{k;j}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{I}_m)} \leq K_1 \left(\|(R_\epsilon)^{\sigma}_{kmj}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{I}_m)} + \|\omega^{\epsilon}_{k;j}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{I}_{m-1})}\right) \tag{3.40}$$

for some constant $K_1 > 0$. By an induction in $m \leq n$, taking into account that the initial data term $\|\omega^{\epsilon}_{k;1}\|_{L^1}$ vanishes for $m \leq 2$, we can write the right hand side in (3.40) as a sum of L^1-curvature terms alone,

$$\|\hat{\omega}^{\epsilon}_{k;j}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{I}_m)} \leq K_1 \sum_{l=1}^{m} \|(R_\epsilon)^{\sigma}_{kmj}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{I}_1\times\ldots\times\mathcal{I}_l)} \tag{3.41}$$

The L^1-peeling property of the curvature (3.19) now implies that the right hand side converges to zero for some subsequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$. From this we conclude that each of the 1-forms constructed are L^1 parallel in every direction throughout $x(\mathcal{U})$ in the sense of (3.6). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

4. A Construction of Locally Inertial Frames in 2-D: Proof of Theorem 1.5

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1, we construct 1-forms with the parallel condition from Step (i) - (ii) and define coordinates y^α by integrating over these 1-forms. The idea is then to use the argument in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.2, where the parallel condition resulted in a cancellation in (3.5) from which the vanishing of the connection in coordinates y^α followed. However, here the 1-forms are only parallel within some error of the order $O(|x|)$ (as a result of the L^∞ curvature bound) which then leads to the connection being order $O(|y|)$ in coordinates y^α which is precisely the condition that y^α are a locally inertial coordinates. Our construction here is done in 2-D and in spherically symmetric spacetimes but does not seem to hold in more general spacetimes.

We begin by constructing two 1-forms $\omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha_k dx^k$ which are parallel in the x^2-direction similar to (3.21) and (3.22) in Step (i) - (ii) above. Namely, we first solve the ODE

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_1\omega^\alpha_j(x^1,0) &\equiv \frac{\partial\omega^\alpha_j}{\partial x^1}(x^1,0) - \Gamma^k_{1j}\omega^\alpha_k(x^1,0) = 0, \\ \omega^\alpha(0,0) &= \mathbf{e}^\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

for each $\alpha = 1,2$ with initial data $\mathbf{e}^\alpha = dx^\alpha$ at the point $(\bar{x}^1,\bar{x}^2) = (0,0)$, and then take the resulting 1-form $\omega^\alpha(x^1,0)$ as initial data to solve the ODE initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_2\omega^\alpha_j(x^1,x^2) &\equiv \frac{\partial\omega^\alpha_j}{\partial x^2}(x^1,x^2) - \Gamma^k_{2j}\omega^\alpha_k(x^1,x^2) = 0, \\ \omega^\alpha(x^1,x^2) &= \omega^\alpha(x^1,0) \quad \text{at} \quad x^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

for each $x^1 \in (-1,1)$. We assume for simplicity the resulting 1-forms are defined for all $(x^1,x^2) \in x(\mathcal{U}) = (-1,1)\times(-1,1)$. By construction, ω^α is parallel in the x^2 direction but we can not expect this to hold also for the

x^1 direction whenever the curvature is non-zero. However, as a result of the L^∞ curvature bound, the ω^α's are approximately parallel:

Lemma 4.1. *The* 1*-forms which we defined as the solutions of* (4.2) *satisfy*

$$\frac{\partial \omega_j^\alpha}{\partial x^i} = \Gamma_{ij}^k \omega_k^\alpha + O(|x|). \tag{4.3}$$

Here and subsequently we use $O(|x|)$ as a shorthand notation for

$$\Big|\frac{\partial \omega_j^\alpha}{\partial x^i} - \Gamma_{ij}^k \omega_k^\alpha\Big|(x^1, x^2) \le K\big(|x^1| + |x^2|\big)$$

for some constant $K > 0$.

Proof. From (4.2), we find that (4.3) holds for $i = 2$ exactly. To prove (4.3) for $i = 1$, observe that with the exact same computation as in (3.26) - (3.29) in Step (iii) above, the ODE (4.2) implies the 1-forms to satisfy the ODE

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^2} &= \Gamma_{2k}^\sigma u_\sigma + R_{k12}^\sigma \omega_\sigma^\alpha \\ \text{for} \quad u_k &\equiv \nabla_1 \omega_k^\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

The Grönwall estimate (3.30) - (3.32) then yields that

$$|\nabla_1 \omega_k^\alpha|(x^1, x^2) \le K \int_0^{x^2} |R_{k12}^\sigma \omega_\sigma^\alpha|(x^1, t) dt,$$

where the constant $K > 0$ depends only on Γ and $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute value. Since the Riemann curvature tensor is assumed to be L^∞-bounded, we get the Lipschitz bound

$$|\nabla_1 \omega_k^\alpha|(x^1, x^2) \;\le\; K\big\|R_{k12}^\sigma \omega_\sigma^\alpha\big\|_{L^\infty} \big|x^2\big| \;=\; O(|x|), \tag{4.5}$$

which is the sought after error estimate (4.3) for $i = 1$. □

As in (3.9), we introduce for each $\alpha = 1, 2$ a function y^α on $x(\mathcal{U})$ by

$$y^\alpha(x^1, x^2) \equiv \int_0^{x^1} \omega_1^\alpha(s, x^2) ds + \int_0^{x^2} \omega_2^\alpha(0, s) ds. \tag{4.6}$$

By definition of y^α we have

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^1} = \omega_1^\alpha \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^1} = \frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^j}.$$

The nontrivial part comes from the x^2-derivative, for which the analog of the above two identities is not trivially implied by (4.6). Nevertheless, from the ODE (4.4) together with the L^∞ curvature bound, we prove the above identities in an approximate sense as recorded in the following lemma.[4]

[4]In (4.6), we are forced to put the integral in x^1 on the ω_1 component for arbitrary x^2, because this is the direction uncontrolled by the ODE (4.4).

Lemma 4.2. *For the coordinates y^α defined in* (4.6)*, we have for each $i,j,k=1,2$ that*

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k} = w_k^\alpha + O(|x|), \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \frac{\partial \omega_j^\alpha}{\partial x^i} + O(|x|). \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. Differentiate (4.6) in the x^2 direction,

$$\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^2}(x^1,x^2) = \int_0^{x^1} \frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2}(s,x^2)ds + \omega_2^\alpha(0,x^2). \tag{4.9}$$

Using

$$\frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2} = \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1} + \left(\frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1}\right)$$

in (4.9) gives

$$\left(\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^2} - \omega_2^\alpha\right)(x^1,x^2) = \int_0^{x^1} \left(\frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1}\right) ds.$$

Now, using that ω^α is parallel in the x^2-direction, we have

$$\frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2} = \Gamma_{12}^\sigma \omega_\sigma^\alpha$$

so that

$$\left(\frac{\partial \omega_1^\alpha}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1}\right) = -\nabla_1 \omega_2^\alpha,$$

and thus

$$\left(\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^2} - \omega_2^\alpha\right)(x^1,x^2) = -\int_0^{x^1} \nabla_1 \omega_2^\alpha \, ds. \tag{4.10}$$

The Lipschitz estimate (4.7) now follows from (4.10) together with the Grönwall estimate (4.5).

To prove (4.8), we use the Lipschitz continuity of the right hand side of (4.10) to estimate the second derivatives of y^α. In more detail, taking the x^1-derivative in (4.10) gives

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^1 \partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1}\right)(x^1,x^2) = -\nabla_1 \omega_2^\alpha. \tag{4.11}$$

Taking the absolute value, the Grönwall estimate (4.5) gives

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^1 \partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^1}\right|(x^1,x^2) \leq K \left\| R_{k12}^\sigma \omega_\sigma^\alpha \right\|_{L^\infty} \left|x^2\right| \;=\; O(|x|),$$

which is the sought after estimate for $i=1$. Similarly, differentiating in the x^2-direction in (4.10) gives

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^2 \partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^2}\right)(x^1,x^2) = -\int_0^{x^1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} \nabla_1 \omega_2^\alpha \, ds$$

and substituting the ODE (4.4) yields

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^2 \partial x^2} - \frac{\partial \omega_2^\alpha}{\partial x^2}\right)(x^1, x^2) = -\int_0^{x^1} (\Gamma^\sigma_{2k} \nabla_1 w^\alpha_\sigma + R^\sigma_{k12}\omega^\alpha_\sigma)\, ds.$$

Using now again the Grönwall estimate (4.5) and using that the curvature is L^∞-bounded, we conclude with (4.8) for the remaining case $i = 2$. □

Theorem 4.3. *Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a two dimensional manifold endowed with a symmetric BV-connection with L^∞-bounded Riemann curvature. Given a point p in a two dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and assume without loss of generality $x^\mu(p) = 0$. Then the $C^{1,1}$ functions $y^\alpha(x)$ defined in* (4.6) *are locally inertial coordinates at p in the sense that $\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}$ vanishes at p and is Lipschitz continuous at p, that is,*

$$\left|\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}\right|(y^1, y^2) \;\leq\; K\big(\left|y^1\right| + \left|y^2\right|\big) \tag{4.12}$$

for some constant $K > 0$.

Proof. Consider the transformation law for connections,

$$\Gamma^k_{ij}\frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k} = \frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}\frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial y^\gamma}{\partial x^j}. \tag{4.13}$$

Combining (4.3) and (4.8), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^2 y^\alpha}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \Gamma^k_{ij}\omega^\alpha_k + O(|x|).$$

Substituting the previous equation into (4.13) and using that $w^\alpha_k = \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^k} + O(|x|)$ by (4.7), the Christoffel symbols Γ^k_{ij} cancel on both sides and we get

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}\frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^i}\frac{\partial y^\gamma}{\partial x^j} = O(|x|).$$

We then conclude with the sought after estimate (4.3), using that $O(|x|) = O(|y|)$ and that the Jacobians $\frac{\partial y^\beta}{\partial x^i}$ are invertible (and thus of order 1). This completes the proof. □

Let us remark that regarding the existence of regularity singularities, it is intriguing that the construction of locally inertial frames here only works out in essentially two dimensions. The reason is that the ODE (4.4) only controls one direction, while the other direction is controlled by the order of integration in the definition of y^α, (4.6). Going to the next ODE step beyond (4.4) (for $n = 3$) again leaves one direction uncontrolled, but for $n = 3$ the analog of definition (4.6) does not give additional control. It is currently not clear whether some structure exists that could provide a suitable control.

5. The Essential Curvature of the singular part of Γ

In this section we assume a $n+1$ dimensional Lorentz manifold $\mathcal{M}$ endowed with a Lipschitz continuous Lorentz metric g such that its Christoffel symbols Γ are BV-functions.

Lemma 5.1. *One can derive from the Lorentz metric g a Riemannian metric h with the same regularity.*

Proof. Since g is symmetric, there exists at each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ eigenvectors $v_k|_p$ of $g|_p$, for $k = 0, ..., n$, and $n+1$ corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_0(p) < 0 < \lambda_1(p), ..., \lambda_n(p)$. For each $k = 0, ..., n$, we now introduce 1-forms $e_j|_p$ on $T_p\mathcal{M}$ in terms of the eigenvector basis by setting

$$e_j|_p(v_k) \equiv \delta_{jk}.$$

The eigenvalues $\lambda_k(\cdot)$ inherit the Lipschitz continuity of g and one can choose the eigenvectors, and thus also the resulting 1-forms, to have the same regularity. The Lorentz metric can then be written in terms of the 1-forms as

$$g = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j \; e_j \otimes e_j.$$

We now define the auxiliary metric

$$h \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{n} |\lambda_j| \; e_j \otimes e_j. \tag{5.1}$$

Given coordinates x^μ, we write the 1-form as $e_j = (e_j)_\mu dx^\mu$ from which follows that the components of h are given by

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{j=0}^{n} |\lambda_j| \; (e_j)_\mu (e_j)_\nu,$$

and a straightforward computation shows that h transforms as a covariant tensor. Clearly, h has the same regularity than g and is positive definite. Thus, h defines a Riemannian metric on $\mathcal{M}$, which completes the proof. □

Given now some BV-connection $\hat{\Gamma}$ defined on $\mathcal{M}$, denote with $(R_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{\mu}{}_{\nu\lambda\sigma}$ the components of $\mathrm{Riem}(\hat{\Gamma})$ and denote with $(h^{-1})^{\mu\nu}$ the inverse of $h_{\mu\nu}$ in some coordinates x^μ. We now define the noon-negative measure $\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big]$ on $\mathcal{M}$ by setting in some coordinates x^μ

$$\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big] \equiv (h^{-1})^{\nu\bar{\nu}}(h^{-1})^{\lambda\bar{\lambda}}(h^{-1})^{\sigma\bar{\sigma}} h_{\mu\bar{\mu}} (R_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{\mu}{}_{\nu\lambda\sigma} (R_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{\bar{\mu}}{}_{\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}}, \tag{5.2}$$

which vanishes if and only if the Riemann curvature of $\hat{\Gamma}$ vanishes. Recall Definition 1.3 of the essential curvature:

Definition 5.2. *Let Γ be the Christoffel symbol of the Lorentz metric g. We define the "essential curvature of the singular part" of Γ as the measure*

$$\alpha(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \inf_{K \geq 0} \alpha_K(\mathcal{U}),$$

for $\mathcal{U}$ some measurable set in $\mathcal{M}$, in terms of the measures

$$\alpha_K(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \inf\Big\{\alpha\big[\Gamma-\tilde{\Gamma}\big](\mathcal{U}) \;\Big|\; \tilde{\Gamma}\in C^{0,1} \text{ a } (1,2)-\text{tensor with } \|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{C^{0,1}}<K\Big\}. \tag{5.3}$$

We are now able to show that, assuming there exists a minimizer $K>0$ of the curvature scalar (5.3) for some measurable set $\mathcal{U}$, then there exists a regularity singularity in the set $\mathcal{U}$ if and only if

$$\alpha(\mathcal{U})>0.$$

Theorem 1.4 is implied by the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.3. *There exists a coordinate system y^α defined on some open set $\mathcal{U}$ in which $\Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}\in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if there exist a $K\geq 0$ such that*

$$\alpha_K(\mathcal{U})=0.$$

Proof. Assume first there exist coordinate y^α in which $\Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ is Lipschitz continuous in some open set $\mathcal{U}$. Theorem 1.1 then implies that there exist a $C^{0,1}$ tensor $\tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\mathrm{Riem}(\Gamma-\tilde{\Gamma})=0$. Thus, $\alpha_K(\mathcal{U})=0$ for any $K>\|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{C^{0,1}}$.

To prove the reverse implication, observe that $\alpha[\cdot]$ is a non-negative measure. Namely, for each point we can choose coordinates such that h agrees with the Euclidean metric at p (by a constant coordinate transformation). In those coordinates each of the components of $\mathrm{Riem}(\hat{\Gamma})$, (for some BV connection $\hat{\Gamma}$), enters $\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big]$ only squared, so that $\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big]$ is a sum of positive numbers at p. Since $\alpha\big[\hat{\Gamma}\big]$ transforms as a scalar, it follows that it is non-negative in any coordinate system. Moreover, by the same argument it follows that $\alpha[\hat{\Gamma}](\mathcal{U})$ vanishes if and only if

$$\mathrm{Riem}\big(\hat{\Gamma}\big)(\mathcal{U})=0, \tag{5.4}$$

for some measurable set $\mathcal{U}$.

Now, assuming there exist some $K\geq 0$ such that $\alpha_K(\mathcal{U})=0$. It follows that there exist some $(1,2)$-tensor $\tilde{\Gamma}\in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{U})$ with $\alpha[\Gamma-\tilde{\Gamma}]=0$ and $\|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{C^{0,1}}\leq K$ by compactness of the space of Lipschitz functions subject to the uniform bound $K\geq 0$, (c.f. the Arcela Ascoli Theorem). By (5.5), we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Riem}\big(\Gamma-\tilde{\Gamma}\big)(\mathcal{U})=0, \tag{5.5}$$

and Theorem 1.1 yields the existence of coordinates y^α in which $\Gamma^\gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ is Lipschitz continuous. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General Relativity and the Einstein Equations*, Oxford University Press, 2009.

[2] D. Christodoulou, *The Formation of Shocks in 3-Dimensional Fluids*, E.M.S. Monographs in Mathematics (2007), ISBN: 978-3-03719-031-9.

[3] C. Dafermos, *Hyperbolic Conservation Laws in Continuum Physics*, Springer Verlag (1999), second edition.

[4] A. Einstein, "Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation", Preuss. Akad. Wiss., Berlin, Sitzber. 1915b, pp. 844-847. **314**(1970), pp. 529-548.
[5] L. C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes, **3A**, 1994.
[6] J. Groah and B. Temple, *Shock-Wave Solutions of the Einstein Equations with Perfect Fluid Sources: Existence and Consistency by a Locally Inertial Glimm Scheme*, Memoirs AMS, Vol. 172, Number 813, November 2004, ISSN 0065-9266.
[7] S.W. Hawking and G.F.R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Spacetime*, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
[8] W. Israel, "Singular hypersurfaces and thin shells in general relativity", Il Nuovo Cimento, Vol. XLIV B, N. 1, 1966, pp. 1-14.
[9] P. Lax, "Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws, II", Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 10(1957), pp. 537-566.
[10] J. Nash,"The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifold", Annals of Mathematics, 63 (1): 2063.
[11] M. Reintjes, "Spacetime is Locally Inertial at Points of General Relativistic Shock Wave Interaction between Shocks from Different Characteristic Families", arXiv:1409.5060.
[12] M. Reintjes and B. Temple, "No Regularity Singularities Exist at Points of General Relativistic Shock Wave Interaction between Shocks from Different Characteristic Families", Proc. R. Soc. A **471**:20140834. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2014.0834
[13] M. Reintjes and B. Temple, *Regularity Singularities and the Scattering of Gravity Waves in Approximate Locally Inertial Frames*, May 2015, arXiv:1506.04074, accepted: Meth. Appl. Analysis.
[14] J. Smoller, *Shock Waves and Reaction Diffusion Equations*, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
[15] J. Smoller and B. Temple, "Shock wave solutions of the Einstein equations: The Oppenheimer-Snyder model of gravitational collapse extended to the case of non-zero pressure", Archive Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 128 (1994), pp. 249-297, Springer-Verlag 1994.
[16] M. Spivak, "A comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry, Vol II", 2nd Edition, Publish or Perish Inc., Berkeley CA, 1979.
[17] A.I. Volpert and S.I. Hudjaev, "Analysis in classes of Discontinuous Functions and Equations of Mathematical Physics", Martinus Mijhoff Publishers, 1985.
[18] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1972.

IMPA - Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Rio de Janeiro, 22460-320, Brasil

E-mail address: moritzreintjes@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

E-mail address: temple@math.ucdavis.edu